

BAHRAIN

Issued by the "Bahrain Freedom Movement" for advancing Civil Liberties and Human Rights

Cosmetic Operation in Manama, and a Serious Surgery in Doha The Message is Clear: Change is Inevitable

The two events that have taken place in the Gulf towards the end of last month have highlighted the need to undertake serious political reforms in the region. The removal of the Amir of Qatar by his son and the formation of the "new government" in Bahrain have come at a time of increased tension in the area following the massive popular unrest in Bahrain which has lasted for six months. However, the Al Khalifa of Bahrain have so far refused to acknowledge the need to reform their system of government. They have continued to reject the demand for the restoration of the Constitutional and start parliamentary elections. Whilst in the neighbouring state of Qatar the political change at the top has come as an "earthquake" to the Saudi regime. Whether they will heed the call for reforms or not will decide the future of the ruling dynasties of the Gulf states. Monarchies who had refused to heed the calls for political reforms in Europe and elsewhere were swept away by the political will of the people, whilst those which reformed their systems remained and prospered. So far, Gulf monarchies have generally remained adamant on their traditional ways of tackling the demands of their people by the use of suppression and violent deterrent methods.

First of all came the long-awaited cabinet reshuffle in Bahrain. The government of Sheikh Khalifa bin Salman Al Khalifa, the Amir's brother, has been in power for twenty years, a record period by all means. The prime minister has refrained from taking any steps to modernise the political system of the country, and has resorted to the suppression of political opponents who had demanded any political reform. He viewed the world as a stagnant place and the tremors that shook the world in the last ten years have failed to leave any impact on his way of thinking. When the popular uprising erupted last December with the people demanding the restoration of the country's 1973 Constitution and the election of an elected national assembly he blamed the whole thing on outsiders and refused the acknowledgement of the legitimacy of people's grievances. In the process, scores of citizens were brutally killed by the security forces acting on orders from the British officer, Ian Henderson, thousands were detained, many were exiled and women and children were maltreated. So far, the country has remained under a virtual curfew, with thousands of detainees. The tension is running high and the ruling tribe has failed to move towards the realisation of the people's demands.

In order to fend off the international criticism, the prime minister attempted to shift the

blame for the illnesses of the country on non-Al Khalifa cabinet ministers by punishing five old ministers who did not offer their whole-hearted support to the suppression of the people. He also punished those who failed to defend the undefendable policies of the Al Khalifa despite their unquestionable loyalties, such as the Information Minister, Tareq Al Moayyad and the Minister of Legal Affairs, Dr. Hussain Al Baharna. The cabinet reshuffle has been dismissed by opposition inside and outside the country as insignificant and a ploy to deflect the attention away from the demands of the opposition especially the restoration of the Constitution. No one in Bahrain has welcomed the cabinet reshuffle because it has no political significance and has failed to address the real grievances of the people. It is expected that the people's demands will still be pursued especially in the next few weeks as the twentieth anniversary of the suspension of the Constitution approaches. (The Amir issued his decree suspending the Constitution and dissolving the parliament on 26th August 1975). As last month's processions (1-12th June) commemorating the event of Ashoura has shown, the people of Bahrain are in no mood to compromise on their demands, and unless the Al Khalifa tribe takes steps towards the realisation of people's demands, the situation is unlikely to improve.

The other most important event that has shaken the Gulf region is the overthrow of the Amir of Qatar, Sheikh Khalifa bin Hamad Al Thani, by his son on 27th June 1995. Although many people were taken by surprise, the event was a natural development that could take place in any other non-democratic state of the Gulf. The elderly Amir was reluctant to approve the open policies of his son, who was the Heir Apparent, Sheikh Hamad, and this led to confusion within the ruling Al Thani family. The domination by Saudi regime over the internal and external affairs of the Gulf has long been a sensitive issue and has often led to tension and dissent. Sheikh Hamad has taken over the leadership of the country three years ago following the attack by Saudi troops on the Qatari border post of Al Khafous. Since then, the Qatari foreign policy has sought to open up to the outside world, forging links with both Iraq and Iran, and paving the way to divergence from the long-standing subservience to the Saudis. The message of the bloodless coup is obvious. Rulers who refuse to change and adapt to new situations and developments risk being overthrown. In the case of Qatar, the change was peaceful and has taken place within the circle of

the ruling family. But in the cases of both Saudi Arabia and Bahrain, the change could come from anywhere. The Saudis are poised to experience a fundamental change in the not-too-far future. It is anticipated that one of two possible scenarios may materialise. The first is that the change will come from within the ruling family and could result in the removal from the scene of King Fahd and his two brothers, Prince Abdulla, the Heir Apparent and Prince Sultan, the Defence Minister. Younger members of the family may take over, and Prince Saud Al Faisal, the Foreign Minister and Prince Salman, the governor of Riyadh, are likely to contest for the eventual leadership. The other scenario, which is also feasible, is a total collapse of the regime under internal and external pressures having failed to adapt to the realities of the world. The existence of the House of Saud in power is gradually becoming a liability rather than an asset even to the Americans. The events in Qatar have shaken the faith in the stability of the regimes of the Gulf countries. They have also proved that the threats to the tribal regimes do not necessarily come from outside, but the nature of those regimes carries the seeds of change within. The Al Khalifa of Bahrain may be the biggest losers from the Qatari events, on two accounts. First, the new ruler is known for his desire to settle the border dispute with Bahrain by any means. He took the case to the Hague and angered the Saudis. Riyadh may intervene as a mediator but the end result may be in favour of the Qataris especially in the present circumstances. Secondly, the internal problems in Bahrain has made the government the weakest in the region. The Al Khalifa have been challenged by almost everyone in the country and their policies have made them unpopular among their own citizens. There is a sharp contrast between the two "new" governments in both Doha and Manama. The former is a youthful one with an agenda of change and challenge to the Saudi hegemony, whilst the latter is a revolt-stricken cabinet patched together only by fear of the prime minister who has established for himself a personality cult similar to that of Saddam Hussain.

The Bahraini opposition feels stronger than at any time in the past. The Al Khalifa, on the other hand, stand out as a symbol of repression, despotism, violation of human rights and opponents of positive change and modernity. The opposition hopes that the Qatari episode will leave its impact on the Al Khalifa and make them realise that the restoration of the Constitution is the best avenue to guarantee a popular legitimacy for their rule.

BFM, BMBOX 6135, LONDON WC1N 3XX, UK. FAX: +(44) 171-278 9089, Email: 100542.1623@compuserve

Bahrain Freedom Movement, P.O. Box 987, Washington DC 20044, USA. Telephone: +(1) 202-298 4424

Al-Khalifas Remain, Others Go

Bahrain's prime minister, Sheikh Khalifa bin Salman Al-Khalifa, submitted his second resignation since independence to his brother, the Amir of Bahrain, on 25 June 1995. The cabinet was formed in 1972 following the election of the Constituent Assembly, when the Al-Khalifa assumed all the "sovereign" ministries since the first day.

In addition to the post of prime minister, the ruling family controls the defense, foreign affairs, interior and justice ministries. Then, the defense minister was the heir apparent, who relinquished his position in the eighties and installed one of his men (also a member of the ruling family) in his place. This change took place in order to minimise face to face contacts and conflicts between the two powerful wings of the ruling family (ie the prime minister and heir apparent). Since then, the prime minister consolidated his position by making his son as minister of communications. The other "sovereign" ministers remained unchanged. The first time the cabinet resigned was on 25 August 1975, when the government failed to win approval of the elected National Assembly to pass the State Security Law which empowers the interior minister to detain political suspects for three years without trial. The same cabinet re-assumed its role on 26 August 1975 upon the dissolution of the parliament. Then, the resignation was to dissolve the parliament. This time the resignation was to consolidate the Al-Khalifa in their sovereign ministries and remove those who either did not agree with the crackdown and suppression of the Bahraini people (like Dr. Ali Fakhroo, Dr. Husain Al-Baharna and Mr. Habib Qassim) or failed to do their job in defending the oppression (like Tariq Al-Moayyad). Non of the Al-Khalifa ministers were changed. This is because they believe they are infallible, above criticism and immune from change. Out of sixteen ministers in the "new-old" cabinet, seven are members of the ruling family controlling all key ministries. While an official stated to Reuters that the four sacked minister should not expect to remain in their positions for life, no word was uttered about members of the Al-Khalifa, most of them being there for more than 20 years (since 1972). Last week (20 June), a group of people were sentenced to life and long term imprisonment to serve as a reminder that the ruling family has no intention of yielding to public pressure. On the other hand, important ministries were handed over to special types of people. The education ministry was given to Abdul Aziz Al-Fadhel, who was brought from the ministry of defense. The information ministry was given to the right hand of the prime minister, Mohammed Al-Mutawwa. All the above indicate that the ruling Al-Khalifa family has not changed their policy or attitude towards the people of Bahrain. It is worth noting that the grand father of the ruling family, Ahmad Al-Khalifa, is officially named as the "conqueror", meaning he conquered Bahrain in 1782 and managed to succumb its inhabitants. The conquered people of Bahrain, according to the Al-Khalifa philosophy, must not dare to consider themselves equals to the masters, or dare to call for better treatment in the name of "rights".

The House of Lords Debates Bahrain's Crisis

The 5th of June is a land mark in the history of Bahrain. On that day, the British House of Lords debated the situation in Bahrain with participation from the three main political parties in the UK, the Conservative, Labour and Liberal Democrats. The debate was led by the Liberal Democrat peer, the Lord Avebury who has championed the cause for democracy in Bahrain.

The Lord Avebury rose at 7.27 pm (5 June) to ask Her Majesty's Government what steps they will take to encourage the Government of Bahrain to promote democracy and human rights. Lord Avebury gave a brief history of the relationship between Britain and Bahrain starting from 1820. "For 150 years, down to the date of independence in 1971, our policy was to maintain the power of the ruling family". "In 1972, the Amir agreed to elections for a constituent assembly. That led in turn to the adoption of the 1973 constitution, under which a national assembly of 30 elected members and 15 nominated government Ministers came into being. But the experiment in democracy lasted for only 18 months. Then the assembly refused to pass a state security Bill, which gave authorities the power to detain anybody for periods up to three years, renewable indefinitely, the Amir dissolved the assembly on 26th August 1975, abrogated the constitution and proceeded to rule by decree". Lord Avebury expressed his astonishment at "the victimisation of the whole family of Sheikh Al-Jamri". He also stated that "the most shocking feature of the whole system of torture, killing and arbitrary detention, is that the one who presides over it, Mr. Ian Henderson, is a British citizen".

Lord Clinton-Davis (Labour) contributed in the debate in length and stated "I believe that respect for human rights need not be inimical to the protection of the fundamental rights of the state to protect itself". "But it hardly applies where there is no law or a complete abuse of it by any government, particularly one not freely elected".

Baroness Chalker (Conservative, speaking for HM Government) stated: "We have encouraged the Bahrainis to contact Amnesty International to agree the terms of such a visit". "The British ambassador will call on the Interior Minister, Sheikh Mohammed bin Khalifa tomorrow (6 June) morning so that the specific cases mentioned in the noble Lord's letter can be raised. I shall of course respond". I wish to make it clear beyond peradventure that Mr. Henderson is not a representative of Britain. We cannot take responsibility for every British citizen overseas and what he does is his own responsibility. He is not placed in Bahrain by us. We have nothing whatsoever to do with him. To quote a famous phrase: He is not one of us".

Earkuer in the day, the Government of Bahrain had attempted to influence the debate by engaging Lord Avebury in a futile debate with the Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Ghazi Mohammad Al Qosbi. He had come from Bahrain for the specific purpose of meeting both Lord Avebury and Amnesty International. The attempt failed drastically as the

The Wall Street Journal: Clamp Down on democracy

Peter Waldman, Staff Reporter for the Wall Street Journal (WSJ) visited Bahrain and wrote one of the most comprehensive articles on the pro-democracy movement. The report appeared in the WSJ of 13 June and covered several critical issues. "There are two worlds in Bahrain. One is the home to the gated compounds of diplomats and western bankers.. But the other world .. is a parched island of mud huts and poverty". "Today, the main grievance of Bahrainis echoes a rising complaint heard in other Gulf states: The gut feeling that local rulers have conspired with outsiders - whether American oil companies, arms makers and the US Defense Department, or offshore bankers and Asian Labor suppliers - to divvy up the spoils of oil for themselves". "Since December, their (ruling family) security forces, composed of British and Pakistani mercenaries, have killed about a dozen unarmed Shiite youth, detained thousands of islanders without charges and besieged the Shiite villages with light tanks".

"You can't get permission for any project now without giving a percentage to the Khalifas" contends Abdul Latif Al-Mahmoud, a popular Sunni cleric whose passport and university post were revoked in 1991 after he spoke out in favor of democracy, reported the WSJ.

"The man in charge of Bahrain's security, a Briton named Ian Henderson, lives in the shadows: seldom seen, rarely photographed, widely feared. Last of a breed of British colonialists who once ran the Gulf".

"Nothing conjures up colonialism, however, like Sheikh's beach, the emir's partly public garden on the Gulf. At the entrance, Pakistani guards check cars for contraband. No cameras, no Arabs, no South Asians, a guard says: "White people and Japanese only". "What about the Indian ambassador?", someone asks. "Indian people - ambassador, minister - not allowed" the guard says. "Arab people, not allowed, not allowed, Emir's orders".

"The regime has always pitted Sunnis and Shiites against each other" says Sheik Mahmoud, the Sunni cleric. "But it is not working this time. The problem is between the people, who wants democracy, and the government which doesn't".

In the villages, the outrage shows no sign of easing. In one home in the village of Diraz, four brothers - ages 13 to 21 - were recently taken by troops from their beds in the middle of the night: they were held for a month before being returned to their family. Says the youngest son "We will fight until we get our rights".

Bahraini envoy failed to convince them of the validity of his government's arguments. He denied, for example, that the State Security Law empowered the Minister of the Interior to order the administrative detention of political suspects for a period of three years. He said the period was three months.

He claimed the State Security Court held its sessions openly, whilst it is known that the proceedings are in secret. He also said that the defendants had the right of appeal against the sentences of the Court. In reality, this right did not exist.

The Calm Before the Storm

The People Continue Their March Despite Repression

* The tenth and eleventh days of the first month of the Islamic calendar (Muharram) are celebrated every year marking the martyrdom of the grandson of Prophet Mohammed. This year the security forces attempted to halt the procession or at least prevent villagers from attending the procession in Manama and prevent the raising of political demands. To this end the security forces encircled Manama with armoured vehicles and filled the streets with paramilitary forces.

What happen in Manama on 10 June must have conveyed the strength of the pro-democracy movement. The procession emerging from Ma'tam (a religious association) Ibn-Salloom alone numbered more than ten thousand alone. Combined with other associations, the number of participants is more than three folds of the normal number. The procession continued until after midnight with slogans raised calling for the freeing of Sheikh Abdul Amir Al-Jamri and the return of parliamentary democracy.

* Larger gatherings and processions took to the streets of Da'ih on 11 June. More than 50 thousands people raised banners and slogans demanding the freeing of Sheikh Al-Jamri, all political prisoners and the restoration of the constitution. The security forces kept their distance as warned by the people who declared their readiness to confront them if dared to interrupt the processions.

* Thousands of leaflets and photographs of Sheikh Al-Jamri were distributed. The people of every town and village raised photographs of the martyrs who were killed by security forces in their areas. At the end of the processions, the participants declared a new phase in the struggle for democracy will be initiated in the coming weeks to call for the unconditional release of all political prisoners, especially Sheikh Al-Jamri and the restoration of constitutional rule. This response proves that the people are not afraid of the security forces anymore. The killing, mass jailing and ruthlessness have strengthened the will of the people of Bahrain as they march for their freedom and rule of constitutional law.

* The month of June witnessed an increase in the number of people arrested across the country. These arrests came amid government's claims that they released 150 people, a figure that bears no truth. In fact some twenty people were released and more than four times that number were detained in their place. Those detained suffer from abuse and torture. The notorious Adel Flaifel stated to those released recently that he and other security officers consider Bahraini youth as a "bunch of insects" and that he and his colleagues have the responsibility of "wiping-out these insects" who dream of some "constitution" and "democracy".

* The security forces refused to release Abdul Jabbar Ibrahim who was acquitted by court on 30 April. Similarly, Mr. Saeed Al-Asbool, the Engineering Manager at the Ministry of Works, who was sacked last November after refusing to remove his sponsorship of the pro-democracy petition, remains without job despite a decision by the court in March that he

should return to his previous position. He had been offered several other positions, the latest was in the aluminium smelter, ALBA, but in each case the security forces intervened and prevented his employment.

* A delegation for the Bahrain Freedom Movement visited France between 14 and 16 June and met with politicians, human rights activists and the media. The delegation explained the situation in Bahrain and called on forces of democracy to assist the people of Bahrain in their struggle for freedom, democracy and human rights.

* On the other hand, the US press has covered the Bahraini issues in the past week. The Wall Street Journal, Washington Post and the International Herald Tribune published articles written by correspondents who visited Bahrain and met with pro-democracy activists as well as others.

* Last month also witnessed several unexpected maneuvers by the security forces. On 20 June, the armoured vehicles besieging the villages were removed. On the same day, prisoners of the uprising received less harsh treatment. A trial was concluded haphazardly with one person receiving a life sentence (25 years) and several others were sentenced to seven years imprisonment. The official press did not report the trial or the sentences fearing from public response.

* At the same time, a military court sentenced a 22 years old person, Mr. Hassan Abdulla, for two years imprisonment. Mr. Abdulla was accused of participating in a peaceful demonstration at the Health Science College on 2 April, following the imposition of house arrest on Sheikh Al-Jamri (which took place between 1-15 April). Mr. Abdulla studied in the college as a sponsored student of the Ministry of Defense.

* The pro-democracy leader, Sheikh Abdul Amir Al-Jamri, in jail since 15 April started a hunger strike on 1 June following his ill-treatment and detention by the Bahraini authorities. On 7 June he was admitted to the military hospital because of a deteriorated health condition. Sheikh Al-Jamri suffered three heart-related problems since the start of his detention on 15 April.

The ordeal of Sheikh Al-Jamri started on 1 April, when he and nineteen members of his family were put under house arrest. Then, the security forces killed two of his neighbours and evicted the surrounding houses from their residents. On 15 April, he was taken away to solitary confinement in Safra military camp. Few days later, it was reported that he had been transferred to the Dry Dock area in the town of Hidd. On 22 June, Sheikh Al-Jamri was admitted to the military hospital for the fifth time, suffering from bad heart conditions due to his detention.

* Asharq Al-Awsat, the Saudi newspaper published in London, was used by the ruling family to spread all sorts of slanders and lies against the pro-democracy activists. One person primarily targeted by the paper was Sheikh Abdul Amir Al-Jamri. Several times, the paper published false accusations about Sheikh

Al-Jamri believing that they could get away with it in the heart of London, where the rule of law is in place (unlike Bahrain). The paper published the following on 8 June:

"The family of Sheikh Abdul Amir Al-Jamri would like to reply to what we published on 9 April, page 4, when we made an assertion that Abdul Amir Al-Jamri doesn't deny that he was in charge of Hizbollah (Party of God) of Bahrain. The family of Sheikh Al-Jamri not only emphatically denies that he controls but equally denies knowledge of the existence of any such organisation. Neither Sheikh Abdul Amir Al-Jamri nor any member of his family has knowledge of an organisation that calls itself or pretends to call itself "Hizbollah of Bahrain". Sheikh Abdul Amir Al-Jamri is unable to issue a direct and personal statement due to his imprisonment in Bahrain".

* On 20 June, a member of the ruling Al-Khlaifa family presiding over the State Security Court passed life and long term imprisonment sentences on a group of Bahrainis accused of participating in pro-democracy demonstrations. The court accused the group of clashing with the police. The court failed to prove that any one of the group participated in the clashes that led to the death of a policeman. Nevertheless, the following were sentenced haphazardly:

(1) Hasan Ahmad Hasan Mohammed Marzooq, 29 years old, worker, life imprisonment (25 years). (2) Jafer Salman Hasan Taqqi, 37 years (father of seven children), technician, seven years imprisonment. (3) Mohammed Hasan Ahmad Abdulla Abbas, 22 years, unemployed, seven years. (4) Husain Mansoor Ahmad Khudhair, 22 years, unemployed, seven years. (5) Qassim Ali Hasan, 19 years, university student, three years imprisonment (6) Abdul Khaliq Isa Hasan Abdulla, university student, three years. (7) Abbas Abd Ali Al-Amar, 23 years, carpenter, three years. (8) Abdul Shahid Abd Ali Mohammed Hasan, 22 years, worker, three years. (9) Jafer Salman Abdul Muhsin Al Toug, 26 years, university student, three years. (10) Ali Mohammed Ali Marhoon, 18 years, student, one year. (11) Ahmad Redha Ahmad Ali Khudhair, 18 years, student, one year. (12) Habib Ali Hasan, 15 years, student, one year.

The court was presided by Abdul Rahman bin Jabir Al-Khalifa who refused to listen to lawyers defending the accused. The lawyers put a case to prove that none of the defendants was involved in the clashes that led to the death of a Pakistani policeman. However, the court decided that the above sentences must be passed to serve as a reminder of the tough stance against pro-democracy movement.

* Dr. Fadheela Al-Mahroos (one of the signatories of the women's petition, see last issue of Voice of Bahrain) was sacked after refusing to remove her name from the signatures. Few days later, she was reinstated to salvage the situation after international media covered the news.

Several other signatories have been threatened in a similar way. On Saturday 3rd of June, the president of the University of Bahrain summoned Dr. Muneera Fakhroo and threatened her that unless she withdraws her name from the petition by the next day, she would loose her name. The threat was not implemented after similar news coverage.

1975: The State Security Law Rejected by Parliament

The roots of the Bahraini uprising goes back to 1975. Then, there was an elected parliament. The government attempted to violate the constitution by issuing a decree for state security measures empowering the minister of the interior to detain political suspects for three years without trial. This was the single issue that united all the elected members of parliament. None of the thirty members approved the government violation of the most basic of human rights and the constitution of the country.

The full text of the State Security Law is translated as follows: "We Issa bin Salman Al Khalifa, Emir of the State of Bahrain, cognat of article 38 of the constitution, in accordance with the proposal of the Minister of Interior, and with the agreement of the Cabinet, decree the following: **DECREE LAW STATE SECURITY MEASURES**

Article 1: If there is serious evidence that a person has perpetrated acts, delivered statements, exercised activities, or has been involved in contacts inside or outside the country, which are of a nature considered to be in violation of the internal or external security of the country, the religious and national interests of the State, its social or economic system; or considered to be an act of sedition that affects or can possibly affect the existing relations between the people and Government, between the various institutions of the State, between the classes of the people, or between those who work in corporations propagating subversive propaganda or disseminating atheistic principles; the Minister of Interior may order the arrest of that person, committing him to one of Bahrain's prisons, searching him, his residence and the place of his work, and may take any measure which he deems necessary for gathering evidence and completing investigations.

The period of detention may not exceed three years. Searches may only be made and the measures provided for in the first paragraph may only be taken upon judicial writ.

Anyone arrested under the provisions of the first paragraph may submit a complaint against the arrest order, after the expiry of three months from the date of its execution, to the Supreme Court of Appeal. The complaint is renewable at the end of every six months from the date of the decree rejecting the complaint.

Article 2: The proceedings of the Court shall always be held in camera and shall only be attended by the prosecution, the complainant and his representative. The proceedings shall be held at the headquarters of the Supreme Court of Appeal. They may be held elsewhere within or outside Manama, if the Court deems it necessary for the maintenance of the security of the country or for considerations of public policy.

Article 3: The court, without observing the procedures stipulated in the Law of Criminal Procedures, may lay down the procedures to be followed by it when it considers the complaints, taking the following into account:

(1) It shall issue its judgment on the basis of the documents submitted by the prosecution and the complainant.

(2) The arguments submitted to the Court, whether by the prosecution or by the defence, shall be in writing.

(3) For the sake of evaluating the evidence, the Court may request the prosecution to submit reports on the evidence.

evidence provided that this shall be limited to persons other than those whose names, residences and places of work are considered to be secret and are not permitted to be disclosed in the interests of the State.

(4) It will be sufficient for the defence witnesses of the complainant to present depositions including information concerning the points which the complainant wishes the witnesses to clarify. The Court may refuse to request depositions from the defence witnesses of the complainant if it is of the opinion that the depositions required from them are irrelevant to the event in question. A decision on the complaint may not be postponed because of any delay by these witnesses in presenting their depositions.

(5) The documents and reports furnished by the prosecution shall be delivered to it in a sealed envelope following the issuance of the Court's judgment. These may not be requested with regard to a new complaint unless there is something new that necessitates viewing them and this shall be permitted by an order of the Court.

(6) Minutes of the proceedings shall be written in one copy. They may not be reproduced or photocopied and, together with the documents of the defence and prosecution as well as the depositions of witnesses, shall be confidential. Following the issuance of the judgment regarding the complaint, they shall be deposited in the cabinet of the Court after they are placed inside a sealed envelope stamped with the seal of the President of the Court which has considered the complaint. It shall be prohibited to open that envelope or to withdraw it from the cabinet except upon a decree by the Court when it is necessary to view it in connection with another complaint. In such a case, a verbatim record of the procedures followed shall be drawn up, in which the condition of the envelope shall be indicated. Then it shall be resealed according to the above-mentioned procedures and deposited in the cabinet after the complaint has been considered. The same procedures shall be followed with regard to every complaint.

(7) The Minister of Interior shall be informed of the judgment of the Court as soon as it is pronounced, through a copy of the document containing the judgment.

Article 4: If the arrested person does not submit a complaint according to the procedure laid down in Article one, the prosecution shall submit the documents to the competent court during the period fixed for submission of the complaint, requesting that the implementation of the detention order should continue.

Article 5: The Minister of Interior may, at any time, order the release of a person in respect of whom an arrest order was previously issued in application of the provisions of this law. The detained person shall be released in any case on the last day of the three years referred to in Article one.

Article 6: All persons who are committed to specified prisons in implementation of detention order issued pursuant to Public Security Order No.1 are considered to be detained under this law and the dates for the submission of complaints are applicable to them; they are entitled to submit such complaints from the date on which this law comes into effect.

Article 7: The Public Security Law of 1965, the Declaration issued on the 22nd of April 1965 and Public Security Order No.1 are hereby repealed.

Article 8: A new paragraph (3) shall be added to Article 79 of the Law of Criminal Procedures, the text of which is as follows:

For crimes detrimental to the security of the State, whether they originate inside the State or outside it, which are stipulated in the Penal Code, the detention order shall be for an unspecified period. The person whose detention has been ordered may submit a complaint against the detention to the authority issuing the warrant if one month has elapsed after the issuance of the warrant. The complaint is renewable one month after the decree rejecting the complaint has been issued.

Article 9: The Minister of Interior shall implement this Law, which shall take effect from the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.

Signed by: Emir of The State of Bahrain (Issa bin Salman Al Khalifa); Prime Minister (Khalifa bin Salman Al Khalifa); Minister of Interior (Muhammed bin Khalifa Al Khalifa). Issued at Rifaa' Palace on 7 Shawwal 1394 (22 October 1974).

The Parliament opposed this unconstitutional decree and after months of deliberations, the following was published in the Bahraini Gazette:

Statement by Bahrain Members of Parliament issued on 14 June 1975 (few weeks before its dissolution on 26 August 1975 by the Amir of Bahrain). The statement declared the united position of all MPs towards the State Security Bill proposed by the government in October 1974. The statement was then published in the Bahraini newspaper Al-Adhwa'a on 26 June 1975. The translation of the text is as follows: ((A meeting was held on 14 June 1975 between the undersigned to discuss the crisis resulting from the decree law on state security measures. The conclusions of the meeting were:

1. The government to declare in an open session of the National Assembly that "in accordance with the report of the Committee for External, Internal and Defence Affairs submitted to the Assembly in relation to the decree law on state security measures, and that after listening to the views of all member of the Assembly, the government promise to review the decree at the latest by the end of July 1975. On that basis the government requests the postponement of the decree until its review"

2. The undersigned also demand that:

(a) The session in which the government declares the above shall be an open one;

(b) The term "review" bears the same meaning of abrogation of the of decree. This shall be recorded in an official meeting for the Committee for External, Internal and Defence Affairs. The latter shall also be attended by the Speaker of the Assembly and the Prime Minister.

(c) The end of July 1975 is the latest date by which the decree shall be abrogated.

Signed by the following MPs: (1) Shelkh Abdul Amir Al-Jamri; (2) Rasool Abd Ali Al-Jeshi; (3) All Saleh Al-Saleh; (4) Abdulla Al-Madani; (5) Mohammed Salman Ahmed Hamad; (6) Mohsin Hamid Marhoon; (7) Khalid Ibrahim Al-Thawad

Sheikh Abdul Amir Al-Jamri headed the MPs in their opposition of the State Security Law. His opposition to this dictatorial decree has brought on him the outrage of the ruling family and their British officered security forces.

The Amir (ruler) of Bahrain responded to the MPs on 26 August 1975 by closing down the parliament and suspending the articles relating to the legislature.

Hence, the pro-democracy movement's aim is the restoration of the constitution and reinstatement of the parliament.